



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,530	02/17/2006	Touru Niizaki	00331063PUS1	4991
2292 7590 03/24/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER ABU ALL SHUANGYI				
ART UNIT 1793		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/24/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION:

Applicant argues that the reference is silent about the relationship set forth in claim 1. The Examiner respectfully submits that it is the position of the examiner that since the charge value difference is determined by the charge value of resin and charge value agent themselves, which is a property of the resin and charge value agent, thus the claimed value difference would be inherent to that of Hashizume absent clear evidence to the contrary. See MPEP 2112. The Examiner respectfully submits that applicant fails to provide any factual evidence to show that the prior art pigment does not have the charge value relation.

Applicant argues that the unexpected result of the instant pigment composition. The Examiner respectfully submits that the data provided are not commensurate in scope with the broadly claimed invention. See *In re Clemens*, 622 F.2d 1029, 1036, 206 USPQ 289, 296 (CCPA 1980) and MPEP 706.02(d). To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside (i.e. as well as the upper and lower limits) the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill* 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).